

Remarks/Arguments

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure because it merely recites Claim 1. The Applicant has amended the Abstract to conform to the requirements of MPEP 608.01(b).

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to delete one of the transitional phrases, so as to conform to the requirements of MPEP 2111.03.

Claim 3 has been similarly amended to remove one of the transitional phrases, so as to conform with the requirements of MPEP 2111.03.

Claim 4 has been similarly amended to delete one of the transitional phrases, so as to comply with the requirements of MPEP 2111.03.

Claim 4 has furthermore been amended to delete the last recitation, so as to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

Claims 1-5 have been amended to consistently use the term "comprises" so as to overcome the Examiner's objection to the concurrent use of the terms "consists" and "comprises".

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being unclear as how data can be sent from a processing device and receive the data at the same processing device. Claim 1 has been amended so as to overcome this rejection.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as conditionally eliminating portions of the method of Claim 1. Claim 5 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over WO00/62505 to Ques et al in view of U.S. Patent 5,481,613 to Ford et al. Ques et al relates to a digital network, and more particularly to a field of digital home networks. There is no second secret

specific to a second domain, where the second secret is contained in a presentation device, as specifically recited in Claim 1.

Ford et al teaches a cryptographic key distribution system for a computer network using multiple keys. There is no reason for Ques et al, which is intended for use in a home network, to provide multiple domains with multiple secrets, as would be useful in a large computer network as taught by Ford et al. Even if the teachings of Ford et al were to be combined with the teachings of Ques et al, the claimed invention would not be taught or suggested. Nowhere does either reference show or suggest a second secret contained in a presentation device, as specifically recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that there is no teaching or suggestion in either Ques et al or Ford et al. of the claimed invention.

In Ques et al, data F' is encrypted with the aid of a secret specific to the second domain $K_{PUB.LOC}$. Ques et al does not teach that the presentation device contains the second secret, as specifically recited in Claim 1.

In Ques et al, scrambled data packets DE are formed using code word CW that are comprised in ECMs encrypted with a key corresponding to key K. The first secret is not specific to the first domain since it is known in the second domain as well. It is clear that the decryption of Claim 1 used with the aid of a second secret being contained in the presentation device is not taught or suggested by Ques et al since decryption does not take place in a presentation device.

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ques et al. in view of Ford et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,192,130 to Otway. The combination of Ques et al with Ford et al has been discussed above. Otway relates to information security subscriber trust authority transfer in a private key. Nowhere does Otway show or suggest a second secret being contained in a presentation device, as specifically recited in Claim 1, from which Claims 2 and 3 depend.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ques et al. in view of Ford et al., Otway, and further in

view of U.S. Patent 5,642,419 to Rosen. The combination of Ques et al, Ford et al and Otway has been discussed above. Rosen relates to a method for requiring and revalidating an electronic credential. However, nowhere does Rosen show or suggest a second secret being contained in a presentation device, as specifically recited in Claim 1, from which Claim 4 depends. Even if all cited references were to be combined, there would be no teaching or suggestion of a second secret being contained in a presentation device, as specifically claimed. It is therefore clear that the cited patent to Rosen does not affect the patentability of the instant claims.

The Applicant therefore submits that the instant invention as claimed complies with all of the requirements of MPEP. The Applicant further submits that the patentability of the instant invention is not affected by the cited references taken singly or in combination. The Applicant therefore submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Alain Durand

Catherine A. Ferguson
Catherine A. Ferguson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,877
609/734-6440

THOMSON Licensing LLC
Patent Operation
Two Independence Way, Suite 200
Princeton, NJ 08540

Date: March 20, 2007

DES/kms